



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,627	06/24/2003	Fernando Cuervo	3430-Z	1150
7590	09/24/2007			
Law Office of Jim Zegeer Suite 108 801 North Pitt Street Alexandria, VA 22314			EXAMINER SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 2145
			MAIL DATE 09/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,627	CUERVO, FERNANDO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/5/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is maintained. Several elements of Applicant's current claims are written in a manner which one of ordinary skill in the art cannot reasonably interpret. For example, claim 1 includes the clause *a scheduler initiating policy evaluation based on received events satisfying passive conditions determining policy-managed entity memberships with respect to the policy equivalency class*. It is not known if the scheduler performs only the step of initiating policy evaluation. The claim can be read that the received events satisfy *passive conditions*, and the *passive conditions are determining policy-managed entity memberships with respect to the policy equivalency class*. Applicant failed to amend these claims in a manner that would eliminate any unclear reading of the terms. Applicant maintained the original claim language. It is unclear what Applicant intends to claim from this exemplary clause.
3. Applicant argues Poliquin failed to disclose a scheduler that performs policy evaluation for determining policy-managed entity memberships with respect to the policy equivalency class. As the claim is best understood to one of ordinary skill in the art, this is taught through the associations of policies with applications in columns 9-10.
4. Applicant argues Poliquin failed to disclose prioritizing the evaluation of policy equivalency classes based on demand for the class and available resources. Applicant did not claim prioritization of the evaluation of policy equivalency classes based on demand for the class and available resources. The claims never mention evaluation based on demand for available resources, or any equivalent language that could be reasonably interpreted to match a check for demand of available resources.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2145

6. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
7. In claims 1, 8 and 11, Applicant claimed a *scheduler initiating policy evaluation based on received events satisfying passive conditions determining policy-managed entity memberships with respect to the policy equivalency class*. It is unclear what Applicant has claimed. One way to read this claim is Applicant claimed a scheduler. Another way to read it is Applicant claimed a scheduler initiating policy, which would be a type of policy. Another way to read this claim is Applicant claimed a scheduler initiating policy evaluation – an evaluation – which would solely consist of data. Similar problems exist with *received events satisfying passive conditions which determine memberships*, which can also read as the received events are *satisfying* the conditions, with *satisfying* being the action taken place as opposed to the *determination* taking place. For purposes of compact prosecution, this clause is treated as a scheduler.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Poliquin et al. (US 5,696,486).

10. In regard to claims 1, and claims 8 and 11, Poliquin disclosed:

a pre-computation module grouping a plurality of policies having the same triggering condition and policy decision into a policy equivalency class; Column 10, lines 21-34

a scheduler, initiating policy evaluation based on received events satisfying passive conditions determining policy-managed entity memberships with respect to the policy equivalency class; column 9, line 60 – column 10, line 20

a triggering module monitoring communication network events satisfying the triggering condition, the triggering module initiating policy evaluation subsequent to the triggering condition being satisfied; and column 7, line 19 – column 8, line 29

a policy decision distribution mechanism issuing the policy decision to the policy equivalency class member policy-managed entities for policy enforcement, column 8, line 30 – column 9, line 13 and

a policy repository for storing the plurality of policies and the policy decision; and column 11, lines 50-67

grouping the plurality of policies into the policy equivalency class, and associating policy-managed entities with the policy equivalency class, provides policy equivalency class restricted policy evaluation reducing policy evaluation overheads. Column 9, lines 45-59

11. In regard to claim 2, Poliquin disclosed:

the policy server being associated with a network management system providing support of one of policy-based network management, and policy-based service provisioning. Column 5, lines 33-39

12. In regard to claim 4, Poliquin disclosed:

the policy repository comprises one of a database and a directory. Column 5, line 45

13. In regard to claim 5, Poliquin disclosed:

the policy repository further comprises a policy condition management interface providing interaction with one of the policies and policy conditions. column 6, lines 45-65

14. In regard to claim 6, Poliquin disclosed:

the policy server being further associated with a policy equivalency class repository for storing policy equivalency class specifications. Column 8, lines 42-49

15. In regard to claim 7, Poliquin disclosed:

a policy condition management interface providing interaction with one of the policies and policy conditions. Column 9, lines 14-67

16. In regard to claims 9, 12, Poliquin disclosed:

Art Unit: 2145

wherein performing policy evaluation based on satisfying the triggering condition, the method further comprises a step of: changing a corresponding policy-managed entity's membership with respect to the policy equivalency class. Column 9, lines 14-67

17. In regard to claim 10, Poliquin disclosed:

monitoring events in a communications network. Column 6, lines 4-65

18. In regard to claim 13, Poliquin disclosed:

prioritizing passive condition related policy evaluation based on a demand for one of a policy and the policy equivalency class. Column 7, lines 34-67

19. In regard to claim 14, Poliquin disclosed:

determining a demand for the one of the policy and the policy equivalency class based on a previous utilization frequency thereof. Column 8, lines 1-41

20. In regard to claim 15, Poliquin disclosed:

specifying a policy condition. Column 10, lines 21-60

21. In regard to claim 16, Poliquin disclosed:

designating the policy condition as one of the triggering condition and a passive condition. Column 10, lines 21-60

22. In regard to claim 17, Poliquin disclosed:

wherein specifying the triggering condition, the method further comprises a step of: specifying one of a time-of-day event, a quality-of-service event, a source available event, a source unavailable event, a broadcast start event, and an information flow available event to be monitored. Column 10, lines 21-67

23. In regard to claim 18, Poliquin disclosed:

logically combining events. Column 15, lines 40-67

24. In regard to claim 19, Poliquin disclosed:

specifying one of a prepaid status event, a policy-managed entity on-line event, a policy-managed entity off-line event, a policy-managed entity capability, and a policy-managed entity interest in a service. Column 10, lines 21-67

Art Unit: 2145

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

· Arrowsmith et al. US 5,777,549

· Thebaut et al. US 5,889,953

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jason Cardone
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

JRS